



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BC2

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/036,501 03/06/98 LOURIE

D 42390.P5104

EXAMINER

LM02/0602

ALLAN T SPONSELLER
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025-1026

NGUYEN, I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2712

DATE MAILED:

6
06/02/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/036,501

Applicant(s)
Lourie et al.

Examiner
Luong Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2712



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 15-32 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 15-32 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Mar 6, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2712

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the informalities addressed in form PTO 948.

In addition, in figure 1, "computer system 100", as disclosed in specification, page 8, should be labeled.

In figure 2, "reset circuitry 260" should be changed to --reset circuitry 265--.

Correction is required.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 13, line 10, "frames are not the same" should be changed to --frames are the same--;

in page 15, line 13, "bus 100" should be changed to --bus 101--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2712

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 15- 16 and 18-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown (US 5,455,561).

Regarding claim 15, Brown discloses a video camera surveillance system comprising memory, disclosed as frame recorder 4 (figure 1, column 3^{4, lines} 34-45); processor, disclosed as detector 7 which compares the difference signal between a frame from the series of frames subsequent to the reference frame and the reference frame, and generates an output signal line 19 if the difference is beyond a preset threshold (figures 1-2, column 4 line 53 through column 5, line 25, column 7, line 67 through column 8, line 7).

Regarding claim 16, Brown discloses a reset circuitry as circuitry for generating an alarm and/or turning on a video cassette recorder (figure 1, column 3, lines 28-29).

Regarding claims 18 and 24, Brown discloses the processor receives frames at a first frame rate when the electronic device is powered up and the processor receives frames at a second frame rate when the electronic device is not power up (column 5, lines 3-25, column 6, lines 63+).

Regarding claims 19 and 23, Brown discloses the processor determines the frame property when the electronic device is not powered up and does not determine the frame property when the electronic device is powered up (column 5, lines 3-26).

Art Unit: 2712

Regarding claims 20 and 25, Brown discloses the property is an average brightness of the frame (column 3, lines 34-44).

Regarding claims 21 and 26, Brown discloses the processor compares frames by comparing a weighted average brightness of the consecutive frames (column 3, lines 34-44, column 4, lines 34-67).

Regarding claim 27, Brown discloses a video camera surveillance system comprising means for receiving a first frame and a second frame, disclosed as frame recorder 4 (figure 1, column 4, lines 34-67); means for determining a property for first frame and for second frame, disclosed as circuitry for discriminating between signals (figure 1, column 3, lines 20-40; column 4, lines 34-67); means for causing the electronic device to power up, disclosed as circuitry for generating an alarm and/or turning on a videocassette recorder (column 3, lines 20-40; column 5, lines 5-25).

Regarding claim 28, Brown discloses means for receiving frames at a reduced rate when the electronic device is powered down (column 5, lines 52-58).

Claim 22 is considered substantively equivalent to claim 27 discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2712

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (US 5,455,561).

Regarding claim 17, Brown fails to explicitly disclose the electronic device is a computer. However, Brown discloses the electronic device is a video cassette recorder which is turned on/off by the video camera (figure 1, column 3, lines 20-30). Computer system is also an electronic device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to replace video cassette recorder by a computer system in order to control computer system by the video camera and save power when operating computer system.

7. Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyake (US 5,631,701) in view of Brown (US 5,455,561).

Regarding claim 29, Miyake discloses an image data transfer system comprising a bus, disclosed as cable 30 (figure 1, column 3, line 25); a processor, disclosed as CPU 130 (figure 1, column 4, line 4); a camera interface, disclosed as communication I/F 124 (figure 1, column 4, lines 5-10). Miyake discloses an electronic camera 10 (figure 1, column 3, lines 20-25). Miyake fails to explicitly disclose a video camera. However, Brown teaches a video surveillance system which has a video camera, a circuitry for generating an analog difference signal between frames, a circuitry for discriminating between signals and a circuitry for generating an alarm and/or

Art Unit: 2712

turning on a video cassette recorder (figure 1, column 3, lines 20-30, column 4, lines 34-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system in Miyake by the teaching of Brown in order to obtain a video surveillance system which alerts security personnel, and start video cassette recorders when an intruder or a fire is detected (column 1, lines 10-13).

Regarding claim 30, Brown discloses the property is an average brightness of the frame (column 3, lines 34-44).

Regarding claim 31, Brown discloses the property is a weighted average brightness (column 3, lines 34-44, column 4, lines 34-67).

Regarding claim 32, Brown discloses the processor receives frames at a reduced rate when the electronic device is powered down (column 5, lines 52-58).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hill et al. (US 5,471,239) disclose detecting scene changes.

Lai (US 5,610,580) discloses motion detection imaging device and method.

Ng (US 5,731,832) discloses apparatus and method for detecting motion in a video signal.

Endsley et al. (US 6,005,613) disclose multi-mode digital camera.

Art Unit: 2712

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Luong Nguyen** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-9297**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reach on **(703) 305-4929**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-6306

or:

(703) 308-6296

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

LN LN
5/19/2000


Wendy Garber
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700